



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2024 by S Indermaur

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/24/3343256

156 Main Road, Naphill, Buckinghamshire HP14 4RU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Philip McQuillen against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/05163/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of detached garage and rear conservatory and the construction of a new single storey rear extension and two new windows and one door on the side elevations of the existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as the demolition of detached garage and rear conservatory and the construction of a new single storey rear extension and two new windows and one door on the side elevations of the existing house at 156 Main Road, Naphill, Buckinghamshire HP14 4RU. In accordance with the terms of application Ref 24/05163/FUL and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1733-P-001 Revision C; 1733-P-002 Revision C; 1733-P-003 Revision C and 1733-P-004 Revision C.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until one ecological feature comprising either a bird box, bat box or bug hotel has been installed within the site curtilage, in positions suitable for their intended purpose.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a relatively modern bungalow. It has a garage set back and to the side and a modest conservatory to the rear. The area is residential, and the dwelling is one in a row of others of similar design and appearance. Neighbouring buildings are larger having been extended. The rear of the plot is screened by tall vegetation. The appeal site is set within the Chilterns National Landscape (CNL) which comprises wooded valleys and rolling hills.

5. The proposal would be deep, across the whole width of the property and a portion of the existing garage. However, the host dwelling sits within a large plot that could accommodate it. The extension would be set down substantially from the roof at ground floor, mimicking the partial hip roof form and would have a stepped rear elevation which would break up the bulk. It would not extend beyond the existing rear building line of the garage or the neighbouring properties.
6. The large glazing panels on the rear would use similar materials to the existing dwelling and be confined to the rear which is well screened. An existing conservatory would be replaced, and similar fenestration appears on the rear elevations of neighbouring properties. The set of doors to the smaller projection would be offset slightly when viewed from the rear but when the elevation is read as a whole, such an appearance would not be unacceptably unbalanced. There would be an expanse of blank faced side elevations, but this is not uncommon given the side by side relationship of dwellings in the street.
7. The Householder Planning and Design Guide and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) set out that rear extensions should be no deeper than half the depth of the original dwelling and elevations should have a greater proportion of solid wall to window. I am aware this would not be the case for the appeal scheme, but these SPDs form guidance and, as I have explained above, the depth of the extensions and solid to void ratio of the extensions would not give rise to harm.
8. The property is largely obscured to the rear by vegetation with some visibility at the front. It would be smaller than the existing garage and of a sympathetic design for the reasons I have set out. The extensions would also be contained within the confines of the street scene and thus a built up rather than rural area. Consequently, the proposal would ensure the scenic beauty of the CNL is conserved. The proposal would therefore meet the aims of Policies CP9, DM35, DM36 and DM30 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019. Together, these seek development that is of high-quality design which respects the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area and conserves and where possible enhances the natural beauty of the CNL.

Conditions

9. For clarity and enforcement purposes, I have set out the time condition and the approved plans which also include detail of matching materials. I have not sought control over the use of the roof of the extension as a balcony as such is not shown on the plans and would need express planning permission. I have set out the development plan's requirement to install an ecological feature proportionate to the development in order to result in a net increase in biodiversity.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The appeal proposal would comply with the development plan, and I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the above conditions.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR